



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,728	12/05/2003	George F. Kick	ONSET.002A	1724
20995 7590 05/04/2009 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER SIMPSON, SARAH A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3731				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/04/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/728,728

Applicant(s)

KICK ET AL.

Examiner

SARAH A. SIMPSON

Art Unit

3731

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SARAH A. SIMPSON.

(3) Jay Lenker.

(2) Rabinder Narula (Reg. No. 53,371).

(4) Ryan Severson.

Date of Interview: 28 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: A brief slideshow was presented and a model of the invention was brought in to further explain the purposes and advantages of the device.

Claim(s) discussed: 25 and 87.

Identification of prior art discussed: Armstrong et al. (US 2002/0099431 A1); Klein et al. (US 5,776,141); Fuqua (US 4,738,666); Nishtala et al. (US 2001/0012950 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed amendments were suggested, which include additional limitations to independent claims 25 and 87. Further limiting the method to describe the proper placement in the renal collection system where the device is expanded and the position of the balloon expanding the sheath would help to overcome the previous rejections made under Armstrong, Klein, Fuqua and Nishtala.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sarah A. Simpson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3731